

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE





UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	APPLICATION NO. FIL		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/882,320	09/882,320 06/15/2001		Andrew Carver	5490-000216	8429	
27572	7590	02/06/2003				
HARNES	S, DICKEY	& PIERCE, P.L	EXAMINER			
P.O. BOX 8 BLOOMFI	-	, MI 48303	PHILOGENE, PEDRO			
				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				3732		
			DATE MAILED: 02/06/2003			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

_5		Application No.	Applicant(s)	100 17-
		09/882,320	CARVER ET AL.	INVI
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		Pedro Philogene	3732	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication or Reply		e correspondence addre	ess
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu - Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REMAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIOnsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by steply received by the Office later than three months after the median patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DN. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply bin. a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) striod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fit tatute, cause the application to become ABANDC	e timely filed days will be considered timely. rom the mailing date of this comm	nunication.
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	<u> 26 December 2002</u> .		
2a)□	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠	This action is non-final.		
3) Dispositi	Since this application is in condition for all closed in accordance with the practice un on of Claims	lowance except for formal matters, der <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11	prosecution as to the n , 453 O.G. 213.	nerits is
4)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-30</u> is/are pending in the applica	ation.		
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with	drawn from consideration.		
5)□	Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)🖾	Claim(s) <u>1-30</u> is/are rejected.			
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
	Claim(s) are subject to restriction an on Papers	nd/or election requirement.		•
9) 🔲 -	The specification is objected to by the Exam	niner.		
10) 🔲 🗀	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)□ a	ccepted or b) objected to by the Ex	xaminer.	
	Applicant may not request that any objection to			
11) 🔲 🗆	The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a)□ approved b)□ disapp	proved by the Examiner.	
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in			
12) 🔲 🛚	The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner.		
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120			
13)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore	eign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	(a)-(d) or (f).	
a)[☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:		., .,	
	1. Certified copies of the priority docum	ents have been received.		
	2. Certified copies of the priority docum	ents have been received in Applica	ation No	
	3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International ee the attached detailed Office action for a	oriority documents have been recei Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ved in this National Sta	ge
	cknowledgment is made of a claim for dome			olication).
a)	☐ The translation of the foreign language cknowledgment is made of a claim for dom	provisional application has been re	eceived.	
Attachment				
2) Notice 3) Inform	of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s	5) Notice of Informa	ary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) al Patent Application (PTO-15	
J.S. Patent and Tra PTO-326 (Rev		Action Summary	Part of Pape	er No. 04



Art Unit: 3732

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rushdy et al (6,319,284) in view of Berman (6,017,366).

With respect to claims 1, 15, 29, 30 Rushdy et al disclose a device (10) for insertion into a first phalange (22) and a second phalange (24) so as to join the first phalange to the second phalange, comprising a substantially elongate member (16,18,20), wherein the member (16,18,20) has a first end portion (16), a middle portion (20), and second end portion (18) spaced and opposed from the first end portion, wherein the middle portion has a curvature; as set forth in column 2, lines 57-67, such that an angle is formed between the first end portion and the second end portion has a surface portion for facilitating retention within the first phalange and the second phalange, as best seen in FIGS.; wherein the angle is substantially anatomically correct; as set forth in column 5, lines 12-45.

Although, Rushdy et al teach that the implant could be made of a number of materials; it is noted that Rushdy et al did not teach of a resorbable material; as claimed by applicant. However, in a similar art, Berman evidences the use of a resorbable



Application/Control Number: 03/00

Art Unit: 3732

material in an implant to prevent impingement of the bone ends and provide tissue infiltration into the space occupied by the implant.

Therefore, given the teaching of Berman, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to construct the implant of Rushdy et al with resorbable material as taught by Berman to prevent impingement of the bone ends and provide tissue infiltration into the space occupied by the implant.

As to the elongated member, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the implant in one piece, since it has been held that forming in one piece an article which was formerly been formed in two pieces and put together involves only routine skill in the art. Howard v. Detroit Stove Works, 150 U.S. 164 (1893).

With respect to claims 2,3,4,6,8,10,12-14,16-18,21,24,25 the above combination of references teach all the limitations, as set forth in columns 1 - 7, lines 1-68 of Rushdy/Berman; and as best seen in FIGS..

With respect to claims 26-28, the method steps, as set forth, would have been obviously carried out in the operation of the device, as set forth above.

Claims 5,7,19,20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rushdy et al (6,319,284) in view of Berman (6,017,366) in view of Bramlet (5,984,970).

With respect to claims 5,7,19,20, it is noted that the above combination of references did not teach of a threaded surface, as claimed by applicant. However, in a



Art Unit: 3732

similar art, Bramlet evidences the use of a joint device with threaded surface to threadably secure the device to the bone substance of the respective bone.

Therefore, given the teaching of Bramlet, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to incorporate thread on the surface of the first end portion to threadably secure the device to the bone substance of the respective bone.

Claims 9,11,22,23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rushdy et al (6,319,284) in view of Berman (6,017,366) in view of Saffar (5,047,059).

With respect to claims 9,11,22,23, it is noted that the above combination of references did not teach of a surface portion selected from the group consisting of shoulders, ribs, helixes or a combination thereof, as claimed by applicant. However, in a similar art, Saffar evidences the use of a joint device consisting of such a surfaces to facilitate implantation in the canal of the bones.

Therefore, given the teaching of Saffar, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the design of the device of Saffar in the device of Rushdy/Berman to facilitate implantation in the canal of the bones.

Response to Amendment

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-30 have been considered but are most in view of this new rejection.

Conclusion



Art Unit: 3732

A shortened statutory period for reply to this action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pedro Philogene whose telephone number is (703) 308-2252. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 6:30 AM to 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin P Shaver can be reached on (703) 308-2582. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9302 for regular communications and (703) 305-3591 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0858.

Pedro Philogene February 4, 2003

PEDRO PHILOGENE